IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

and

STATE OF ILLINOIS

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 15-cv-11473 Judge Jorge L. Alonso Mag. Judge Jeffrey Cole

v.

ADVOCATE HEALTH CARE NETWORK,

ADVOCATE HEALTH AND HOSPITALS CORPORATION,

and

NORTHSHORE UNIVERSITY HEALTHSYSTEM

Defendants.

PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSAL REGARDING CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION IN THE COURT'S PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION MOTION OPINION

Plaintiffs Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") and the State of Illinois (collectively with FTC, "Plaintiffs")¹ understand that the Court's opinion on the preliminary injunction motion may contain confidential or highly confidential information as designated by the parties or by third parties. Therefore, in advance of the joint status hearing scheduled for June 7, 2016, Plaintiffs respectfully submit this proposal and suggest for the Court's consideration the following process to ensure that confidential information is properly protected in the Court's opinion on the preliminary injunction motion. This proposal is similar to the process the court ordered in both

Counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendants discussed this proposal prior to filing. Defendants do not agree and object to the filing of this proposal as improper.

FTC, et al. v. Sysco Corp., et al., 15-cv-00256 (D.D.C. 2015), and FTC, et al. v. Staples, Inc., et al., 15-cv-02115 (D.D.C. 2016). See Ex. 1 n.1; Ex. 2 n.1.

- 1. The Court issues a short, publicly available Order on the docket notifying the public of the Court's decision on the preliminary injunction motion.
- Simultaneous to the publicly available Order, the Court issues its unredacted opinion under seal and provides counsel for the Plaintiffs and outside counsel for the Defendants with access to its unredacted opinion.
- 3. Counsel shall review the unredacted opinion, meet-and-confer, and present for the Court's consideration joint proposed redactions to the opinion no later than 5:00 pm Central Time on the third business day following the issuance of the unredacted opinion. During this time, it will be the responsibility of the parties to notify third parties if their confidential or highly confidential information is contained in the Court's unredacted opinion and obtain third parties' input as to whether any redaction of their information should be made in the opinion.
- 4. To the extent the parties do not agree on specific redactions, the parties will present competing proposals to the Court with an explanation for why information should or should not be redacted.
- 5. Subsequent to the submission of the parties' proposed redactions, the Court will consider the parties' proposals and issue a public version of its opinion.

Dated: June 3, 2016 Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ J. Thomas Greene

J. Thomas Greene, Esq. Kevin Hahm, Esq. Sean P. Pugh, Esq. Federal Trade Commission Bureau of Competition 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20580

Telephone: (202) 326-3201 Facsimile: (202) 326-2286 Email: tgreene2@ftc.gov Email: khahm@ftc.gov Email: spugh@ftc.gov

Counsel for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission

/s/ Robert W. Pratt

Robert W. Pratt, Esq. Office of the Attorney State of Illinois 100 West Randolph Street Chicago, IL 60601

Telephone: (312) 814-3000 Facsimile: (312) 814-4209 Email: rpratt@atg.state.il.us

Counsel for Plaintiff State of Illinois